

EVALUATION SYSTEMS COMMITTEE MEETING  
January 30, 2003

The Evaluation Systems Committee met January 30, 2003 at 2:15 p.m. in the conference room of Building 1.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Dixon Boyles  
Sandra Edwards  
Kay Hauser  
Chet Jarman (for Barbara Francisco)  
Mandy Jones  
Jim Matson

Riley Mills  
Marcia Norwood  
Lori McNeil  
Dorie Richter  
Rebecca Spain

ABSENT:

Wesley Beddard  
Penny Sermons  
Barbara Francisco

The meeting was called to order by the Evaluation Systems Committee Chair, Dorie Richter. The following items were discussed:

**I. Staff Performance Guidelines and Evaluation Instrument**

**A. Guidelines. The following changes were suggested**

- page 2, #1: change to read "Each employee is to be evaluated ~~no less than~~ **at a minimum** of one time per year. ~~Every new full-time employee must be evaluated two times during the year with the first evaluation occurring during the first term of employment.~~"

- page 2, #2: change (**bold type**) and move to end of paragraph "At the time of the annual evaluation conference, each employee and his/her supervisor ~~will~~ **may** also agree upon an Individual Professional Development Plan for the upcoming year."

- page 2, #3: delete

A motion was made by Sandra Edwards to accept the changes to the Staff Performance Guidelines; Kay Walker Hauser seconded the motion. With no further discussion, the motion carried.

**B. Evaluation Instrument. The following changes were suggested**

Add "\*\*\*Comments following each section are required if 'Exceeds Expectations' or 'Does Not Meet Expectations' is checked." to be placed under the sentence "Please rate (√) each activity..."

Delete "Extent to which the", "Extent to which attention is given by the", and "Consider" in all sections where found. (Refer to the attached copy of the Staff Performance Evaluation by Supervisor.)

A motion was made by Jim Matson to accept the changes to the Staff Performance Instrument; Marsha Norwood seconded the motion. With no further discussion, the motion carried. (Dorie Richter will email Administrative Council members a copy of this instrument for their approval. If approved, the implementation of the Staff Performance Evaluation instrument can begin this month.)

**II. Evaluation of College Services Surveys, Spring 2003**

**A. Student Evaluation of College Services**

- page 1, Media/Graphics Services #1: add "4. Technical support for on line courses meets my needs."

- page 1, Developmental Education Department Services #1: add “MAT 50.”
- page 2: Add new section and questions with the appropriate rating scale to read “**Food Services** 1. Prices are reasonable. 2. Service is provided in a prompt, efficient, and courteous manner. 3. The selection of food and beverages from the food service is... 4. Overall, Food services are...”
- page 2, Maintenance and Operations, heading: change to read: **Maintenance and Operations of Buildings and Grounds.**
- page 3, Admissions #2: Move to Recruitment/Advertising, #4.
- page 3, Recruitment/Advertising #1: add “advertising” to read “Do recruiting activities, **advertising**, and published materials accurately and honestly represent the College.”
- page 3, Recruitment/Advertising #4: add “Does Not Apply.”
- page 3, Career Development Center, heading: add **/Co-op.**
- page 3, Career Development Center/Co-Op: add “7. Co-Op Services are provided in a prompt, efficient, and courteous manner.”
- page 4, Workforce Investment Act: Delete all questions.
- page 4: Add new section, **Registration** and the following - “1. Based on your experience during registration, do you have any helpful suggestions?” and, “2. Did you register \_\_\_\_\_ on the RAP line? \_\_\_\_\_ face to face?”
- page 4, Student Government Association: Delete # 3.

A motion was made by Dixon Boyles to accept the changes to the Staff Performance Instrument; Riley Mills seconded the motion. With no further discussion, the motion carried.

#### **B. Faculty/Staff Evaluation of College Services, Spring 2003**

- page 1, Business Affairs: add “6. Voicemail service is..... Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor, and DNU.”
- page 2: Add new section and questions with the appropriate rating scale to read “**Food Services** 1. Prices are competitive and affordable. 2. The food service offers an adequate selection of foods and beverages. 3. Service is provided in a prompt, efficient, and courteous manner.”
- page 5, Recruitment/Advertising #2: add “advertising” to read “Do recruiting activities, **advertising**, and published materials accurately and honestly represent the College.”
- page 5, Career Development Center, heading: add **/Co-op.**
- page 5, Career Development Center/Co-Op: add “4. Co-Op Services are provided in a prompt, efficient, and courteous manner.”

A motion was made by Jim Matson to accept the changes to the Faculty/Staff Performance Instrument; Mandy Jones seconded the motion. With no further discussion, the motion carried.

### **III. Performance Standards**

Dorie Richter gave a brief update on the performance standards. The survey results for “completer” goal attainment and for “completer and non-returning student” student satisfaction have been submitted to the NC Community College System, Planning and Research Department.

Jim Matson made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Kay Walker Hauser seconded the motion. Having no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:40 p.m.